be critical to ensuring our safety here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of the 44 members of the 143rd Security Forces Squadron from the Rhode Island Air National Guard who were called up to active duty. They possess a fierce spirit which burns most brightly when it is given direction and purpose, and this is the time, more than ever, to utilize that spirit.

While I take strength in their immense abilities and know that they will help ensure America's safety, I look forward to welcoming them all home to Rhode Island very soon.

□ 1300

DR. SHIRLEY TILGHMAN ASSUMES PRESIDENCY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday in my congressional district, I had the honor along with 4,000 students, parents, dignitaries, and local residents to gather in front of historical Nassau Hall to witness Dr. Shirley Tilghman take the office as the 19th President of Princeton University.

Dr. Tilghman is highly qualified to head Princeton University. She is a world-renowned biology researcher, a beloved teacher, and a leader of vision. In her inaugural address, Dr. Tilghman spoke of the freedom to pursue ideas as an essential investment in the strength of our national character, our culture, and our material lives.

Now more than ever in America, we need institutions of higher education to perform this critical function. At this time of great national introspection and examination, the university and its defense of enduring values are more relevant than ever. This relevance resounded clearly in Dr. Tilghman's address. It is evident to me that this prestigious university has a president very worthy to join the sequence of distinguished scholars who have led it over the past few centuries.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the full text of Dr. Tilghman's address.

DISCOVERY AND DISCOURSE, LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE: THE ROLE OF THE ACADEMY IN TIMES OF CRISIS

Faculty, students, staff, trustees, alumni and neighbors of Princeton University, distinguished guests, family and friends:

It is a deep honor for me to assume the office of 19th President of this great university. I accept with both eagerness and humility, knowing full well that I follow in the footsteps of predecessors who have provided Princeton with extraordinary leadership over the past century. Presidents Goheen, Bowen and Shapiro, all of whom are present to witness this beginning of a new presidency, have provided us with a legacy that is envied in all quarters of higher education, a legacy that we will cherish and protect, but also one that we will use as a strong foundation on which to build our future.

Our vision of that future was forever changed by the tragic events of September 11 at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and a field in Pennsylvania. In the aftermath of those events, I modified the address that I had been writing in order to speak with you about what is foremost on my mind. President Bush, in his address to a joint session of Congress last week, declared war on international terrorism, a war whose form and outcome are difficult to imagine. Given the enormous challenges and the uncertainty that lie ahead, what is the proper role of the academy during this crisis and in the national debate we are sure to have? How can we contribute as this great country seeks the honorable path to worldwide justice and to peace?

Today the academy holds a highly privileged place in American society because of a long-standing national consensus about the value of education. Another of my predecessors, President Harold Dodds, said in his inaugural address in 1933 that ''No country spends money for education, public and private, so lavishly as does the United States. Americans have an almost childlike in what formal education can do for them.'' That faith is base don a conviction that the vitality of the United States, its creative and diverse cultural life, its staggeringly inventive economy, its national security and the robustness of its democratic institutions owe much to the quality of its institutions of higher education. The spirit of democracy is now reflected more than ever in our education system, with opportunities open to students of all stripes, from 18-year-old freshmen to senior citizens; from students given every imaginable advantage by their parents to students who spent their childhoods living on the streets; from the New Jersey-born to students from around the globe; from students who were ignited by learning from the first day of primary school to high school drop outs who came to formal education through the school of hard knocks. If you will forgive a biologist the impulse to use a scientific metaphor, the American education landscape is like a complex ecosystem, full of varied niches in which a rich diversity of organisms grow and thrive.

Our society's confidence in its institutions of higher education is expressed through the generous investments of the federal and state governments in basic and applied research, investments that wisely couple support for research with support for graduate education. It is also expressed through federal and state investments that subsidize the cost of higher education for those who cannot afford to pay, investments by private foundations and charities who see colleges and universities as the best routes for achieving their strategic goals, and investments by individuals and by the private sector, who see universities as the incubators of future health and prosperity. In return for this broad support, society rightfully expects certain things from us. It expects the generation of new ideas and the discovery of new knowledge, the exploration of complex issues in an open and collegial manner and the preparation of the next generation of citizens and leaders. In times of trouble, it is especially important that we live up to these expectations.

The medieval image of the university as an ivory tower, with scholars turned inward in solitary contemplation, immunized from the cares of the day, is an image that has been superseded by the modern university constructed not of ivory, but of a highly porous material, one that allows free diffusion in both directions. The academy is of the world, not apart from it. Its ideals, crafted over many generations, are meant to suffuse the national consciousness. Its scholars and teachers are meant to move in and out of the academy in pursuit of opportunities to use their expertise in public service, in pursuit of creative work that will give us illumination and insight and in pursuit of ways to turn laboratory discoveries into useful things. Our students engage the world with a strong sense of civic responsibility, and when they graduate they become alumni who do the same. This is as it should be.

Yet the complex interplay between society and the academy also creates a tension, because the search for new ideas and knowledge is not and cannot be motivated by utilitarian concerns. Rather it depends on the ability to think in new and creative ways, to challenge prevailing orthodoxies, to depart from the status quo. We must continually strive to preserve the freedom of our students and our scholars to pursue ideas that conflict with what we believe or what we would like to believe, and to explore deep problems whose solutions have no apparent applications. This is not a privilege we grant to a handful of pampered intellectuals; rather it is a defining feature of our society and an essential investment in the continuing strength of our character, our culture, our ideas and our material lives. When the Nobel laureate John Nash developed the mathematical concepts underlying non-cooperative game theory as a graduate student at Princeton, he could not foresee that those concepts would be used today to analyze election strategies and the causes of war and to make predictions about how people will act. When Professor of Molecular Biology Eric Wieschaus set out as a young scientist to identify genes that pattern the body plan of the fruit fly embryo, he could not know that he would identify genes that play a central role in the development of human cancer. We have learned that we cannot predict with any accuracy how discoveries and scholarship will influence future generations. We also have learned that it is unwise to search only in predictable places, for new knowledge often depends upon preparing fertile ground in obscure places where serendipity and good luck, as well as deep intelligence, can sprout. Freedom of inquiry, which is one of our most cherished organizing principles, is not just a moral imperative, it is a practical necessity.

Just as we have an obligation to search widely for knowledge, so we also have an obligation to insure that the scholarly work of the academy is widely disseminated, so that others can correct it when necessary, or build on it, or use it to make better decisions, develop better products or construct better plans. In the days ahead, I hope that our country's decision makers will draw on the knowledge that resides on our campuses, on historians who can inform the present through deep understanding of the past, philosophers who can provide frameworks for working through issues of right and wrong, economists whose insights can help to get the economy back on track, engineers who know how to build safer buildings, scientists who can analyze our vulnerabilities to future attack and develop strategies for reducing those vulnerabilities, and scholars in many fields who can help them understand the motivations of those who would commit acts of terrorism here and throughout the world.

American universities have been granted broad latitude not only to disseminate knowledge, but to be the home of free exchange of ideas, where even the rights of those who express views repugnant to the majority are vigorously protected. Defending academic freedom of speech is not particularly difficult in times of peace and prosperity. It is in times of national crisis that our true commitment to freedom of speech

and thought is tested. History will judge us in the weeks and months ahead by our capacity to sustain civil discourse in the face of deep disagreement, for we are certain to disagree with one another. We will disagree about how best to hold accountable those responsible for the attacks of September 11. We will disagree about how broadly the blame should be shared. We will disagree about the ways in which nationalism and religion can be perverted into fanaticism. We will disagree about whether a just retribution can be achieved if it leads to the deaths of more innocent victims. We will disagree about the political and tactical decisions that our government will make, both in achieving retribution and in seeking to protect against similar attacks in the future. We will disagree about how and when to wage war and how best to achieve a real and lasting peace.

The conversations we will have on our campuses are not intended to reach a conformity of view, a bland regression to the mean. Rather we aim to come to a deeper appreciation and understanding of the complexity of human affairs and of the implications of the choices we make. Perhaps, if we are very dedicated, we will find the wisdom to see an honorable, yet effective, path to a world in which terrorism is a thing of the past. With generosity of spirit and mutual respect, we must listen carefully to one another, and speak with our minds and our hearts, guided by the principles we hold dear. By conducting difficult discussions without prejudice or anger, by standing together for tolerance, civil liberties and the right to dissent, by holding firm to core principles of justice and freedom and human dignity, this university will serve our country well. By so doing, we will be true patriots.

Let me now turn to the third obligation that we have to society: the education of the next generation of citizens and leaders. Princeton's view of what constitutes a liberal arts education was expressed well by Woodrow Wilson, our 13th President, whose eloquent words I read at Opening Exercises:

''What we should seek to impart in our colleges, therefore, is not so much learning itself as the spirit of learning. It consists in the power to distinguish good reasoning from bad, in the power to digest and interpret evidence, in the habit of catholic observation and a preference for the non partisan point of view, in an addiction to clear and logical processes of thought and yet an instinctive desire to interpret rather than to stick to the letter of reasoning, in a taste for knowledge and a deep respect for the integrity of human mind.''

Wilson, and the presidents who followed him, rejected the narrow idea of a liberal arts education as preparation for a profession. While understanding the importance of professional education, they made it clear that at Princeton we should first and foremost cultivate the qualities of thought and discernment in our students, in the belief that this will be most conducive to the health of our society. Thus we distinguish between the acquisition of information, something that is essential for professional training, and the development of habits of mind that can be applied in any profession. Consequently we celebrate when the classics scholar goes to medical school, the physicist becomes a member of Congress, or the historian teaches primary school. If we do our job well as educators, each of our students will take from a Princeton education a respect and appreciation for ideas and values, intellectual openness and rigor, practice in civil discourse and a sense of civic responsibility. During these troubled times, our students and our alumni will be called upon to exercise these qualities in their professions, their communities and their daily lives. By so doing, and through their leadership, their vision and their courage, they will help to fulfill Princeton's obligation to society and bring true meaning to our motto, ''Princeton in the nation's service and in the service of all nations.''

Thank you.

SCREENING BAGGAGE FOR EXPLOSIVE DEVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share some information to my colleagues that is pertinent to our next several hours of us in the House of Representatives. The reason I say that is in the next several hours probably about 80 percent of us will be getting on airplanes. We are going to go out to Dulles, some to National. We are going to get on airplanes to fly back to our districts to work with the people who have been so traumatized by our recent losses, and that is part of our duty to do it.

But what the information I want to share with my colleagues is that when we get on those airplanes in the next several hours, we will be getting on the airplanes with 100, 150, 200, maybe 300 other Americans. All of those Americans will be getting on airplanes that have not had the baggage screened for explosive devices when they are put in the belly of the jets that we get on.

The sad fact is that today I have found and many others in the last few weeks, much to our surprise, that our security apparatus does not screen for explosive devices on bags that are put in the baggage compartments of our airlines. The reason that we have not done that in the past is two-fold. Number one, the theory has been in the past that we do not have to screen for bombs in luggage. All we have to do is to make sure that the people who put the baggage on get on with the plane, under the assumption that no one would want to go down with the plane. Well that assumption is certainly moot after September 11. That basis for our strategy has greatly outlived its purpose.

The second reason that we have not screened for bombs on aircraft in the baggage compartment is that it has involved some cost. But, Mr. Speaker, I can state that I am very, very confident that the hundreds of people that are going to get on the airplane at Dulles and National today believe that the cost is worth it to screen for bombs in the baggage compartment of airplanes. The threat is too great, the potential loss is too great, and the available technology is too good not to use it. The fact is we have technology that can sniff with high level, actually not sniff, but they use another technology, a high level of probability will catch explosive devices, but we are simply not using it.

As a result of that, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), and myself and 14 others introduced yesterday the Baggage Screening Act which will require that bags shall be screened for explosive devices before they go on an airplane 100 percent. Right now maybe 5 or 10 percent are screened. That is not enough. That means 90, 95 percent of our bags are not screened for explosive devices. That is not good enough security for American people.

The reason we introduced this bill is that today and in the next few days, we are attempting to reach a bipartisan consensus on a security package for airlines. We want to bring to the attention of our leadership that this feature needs to be in our security package. We need to screen for explosive devices. It is the right thing to do. We need to find a way to pay for it. If we do that, a lot of Americans will feel a lot more confident. If we take away nail clippers from passengers, let us keep the bombs out of the baggage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STRICKLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CIVILIZATION WILL DEFEAT TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been heartened by the way the Americans have pulled together after the attack of September 11. We have seen the best qualities of America at work, pride, patriotism, courage. Passengers on the plane that went down in Pennsylvania foiled their hijackers' diabolical objective by fighting for freedom. Police, fire, and rescue workers disregarded grave risks to their own lives just to save others. The President rallied America to our purpose through his determination and his grand leadership. And from across the country, we feel a wave of love and support and patriotism.

We saw the best of America after the raw hand of evil struck our Nation. We are left with a defining question. How will we best protect our way of life from those who would destroy freedom to lower an evil nightmare over the free world? It starts with our mindset. Too many people thought that threats to the United States ended with the Cold War. The first thing we have to do is to reinvigorate the idea that freedom is never free. Our way of life has a price tag.

Our founding fathers knew that price of freedom is eternal vigilance. Now we